L1KsMORc UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15 CR 379 (PKC) V. Telephone Conference 5 OTTO RENE SALGUERO-MORALES and RONALD ENRIQUE SALGUERO-PORTILLO, 6 Defendants. 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. 9 January 20, 2021 10:00 a.m. 10 Before: 11 12 HON. P. KEVIN CASTEL, 13 District Judge 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 AUDREY STRAUSS United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 DANIEL NESSIM KYLE WIRSHBA 18 Assistant United States Attorneys ROBERT FEITEL 19 Attorney for Defendant Salguero-Morales 20 LINDA GEORGE 21 Attorney for Defendant Salguero-Portillo 22 ALSO PRESENT: Sonia Berah, Spanish Language Interpreter Carlos Camacho, Spanish Language Interpreter 23 24 25

1	(The Court and all parties appearing telephonically)
2	THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Castel.
3	Lisa, thank you for your patience with getting this
4	all organized. I appreciate your hanging with us.
5	We'll go on the record. This is United States of
6	America v. Ronald Enrique Salguero-Portillo and Otto
7	Salguero-Morales.
8	Appearing for the government?
9	MR. WIRSHBA: Good morning, your Honor. Kyle Wirshba
10	for the government, and Daniel Nessim is also on the line.
11	THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Wirshba and
12	Mr. Nessim.
13	Appearing for Mr. Salguero-Portillo?
14	MS. GEORGE: Linda George for Ronald Enrique
15	Salguero-Portillo.
16	Good morning, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. George.
18	For Otto Salguero-Morales?
19	MR. FEITEL: Good morning, your Honor. Robert Feitel
20	for Otto Salguero-Morales.
21	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Feitel.
22	First of all, I understand there is an interpreter, a
23	certified interpreter, for Mr. Salguero-Portillo, is that
24	correct?
25	INTERPRETER BERAH: Yes, your Honor. That is correct,

1	Spanish interpreter for Mr. Portillo.
2	THE COURT: Please identify yourself.
3	INTERPRETER BERAH: Sonia Berah, Spanish interpreter
4	for Mr. Portillo.
5	THE COURT: Thank you.
6	For Otto Salguero-Morales?
7	INTERPRETER CAMACHO: Good morning, your Honor. This
8	is Spanish Interpreter Carlos Camacho for Mr. Morales.
9	THE COURT: You're a certified interpreter?
10	INTERPRETER CAMACHO: Yes, I am, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Thank you. My apologies for asking those
12	questions.
13	Mr. Portillo, can you hear me?
14	DEFENDANT SALGUERO-PORTILLO: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Morales, can you hear me?
16	DEFENDANT SALGUERO-MORALES: Yes.
17	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Portillo and Mr. Morales,
18	you have the right to be present at a conference before the
19	judge in a courtroom with the judge on the bench, the
20	prosecutor present, the interpreter present, the court
21	stenographer, and most importantly, your own counsel at your
22	side.
23	I've been advised that you wish to waive that right
24	and proceed today with this conference by telephone.

Is that right, Mr. Portillo?

1	DEFENDANT SALGUERO-PORTILLO: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Morales?
3	DEFENDANT SALGUERO-MORALES: Yes.
4	THE COURT: All right. Ms. George, have you discussed
5	this with your client previously?
6	MS. GEORGE: Yes, I did, and I had him sign a waiver
7	as well.
8	THE COURT: Thank you.
9	Mr. Feitel, have you discussed this with your client?
10	MR. FEITEL: Yes, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
12	Let me say to Mr. Portillo and Mr. Morales, if at any
13	point in this proceeding this morning you wish to speak in
14	private with your lawyer, I will give you the opportunity to do
15	that.
16	Do you understand that, Mr. Portillo?
17	DEFENDANT SALGUERO-PORTILLO: Yes, I do.
18	THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr. Morales?
19	DEFENDANT SALGUERO-MORALES: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Now, with regard to one other preliminary,
21	I want to make this statement on the record.
22	I direct the prosecution to comply with its obligation
23	under <u>Brady v. Maryland</u> and its progeny to disclose to the
24	defense all information, whether admissible or not, that is
25	favorable to the defendant, materially of the guilt or

punishment and known to the prosecution. Possible consequences for noncompliance may include dismissal of individual charges or the entire case, exclusion of evidence, and professional discipline or court sanctions on the attorneys responsible.

I will be entering an order -- I have already entered a written order more fully describing this obligation and the possible consequences of failing to meet it. I direct the prosecution to review and comply with that order.

Does the prosecution confirm that it understands its obligations and will fulfill them?

MR. WIRSHBA: Kyle Wirshba.

Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Nessim?

MR. NESSIM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. Now, in the case of Mr. Morales on

June 29, in the case of Mr. Portillo on July 27, and I want to
inquire of the government, can you confirm that all discovery
has been produced and can you tell me when discovery was
produced as to each of these two defendants?

MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor.

As your Honor knows from a letter submitted to the court in June of this year under seal, the parties had discussed the discovery and updated the court as to the plan for discovery in this case.

More recently, there was a change of counsel, in fact, and the parties re-engaged with each other with respect to discovery, and the defendants elected to receive a certain amount of discovery, which the government has provided on January 14.

At this point, Rule 16 discovery is complete.

THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me that the defendants -- which defendant received discovery on January 14?

MR. WIRSHBA: They both did, your Honor. Both defendants.

THE COURT: OK. Mr. Feitel, I take it the defendants require time to review that discovery and be in a position to advise me whether there are any motions they wish to make in this case; is that correct?

MR. FEITEL: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. George, is that true as to you and your client?

MS. GEORGE: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I guess my question is, would mid March give you enough time to review the material and be in a position to advise me whether there are any motions your clients wish to make?

MR. FEITEL: Good morning, your Honor. Robert Feitel for Otto Salguero.

I think that would be sufficient, your Honor. If it

turns out that it is not, we will take steps to advise the court before the scheduled next status hearing.

THE COURT: Ms. George.

MS. GEORGE: Your Honor, the only question I have, and I wanted to just continually keep this on the record and to the court, that it is very difficult for these individuals to review discovery in the confines now, especially under the lockdown. They get 30 minutes a day out of their cell, and that gives them very limited opportunity to look at numerous — I mean, I have a terabyte drive of documents that were sent to me. I'm not sure that by March I would know that. We will try. The problem is, if I can get in to see them, that would be one thing, but I cannot. We are kind of stuck on this.

The other issue with my client, in any event, is that he has difficulty with the computer. He is not computer literate, and not that I am to any great extent, but in any event, he is worse. So this is just a problem that I want the court to keep in mind. I will try to do what I can, but I'm not optimistic about March.

THE COURT: What are you asking me to do?

MS. GEORGE: I mean, your Honor, if you can set a date and maybe we can advise you maybe, like, you know, like two weeks before that date as to how we're going and maybe extend it again. I'm just concerned because I really have no time to look at anything.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'll ask my courtroom deputy, if you can give us a date in the second half of March for us to get together.

Now, this will be an outside date. In fact, because the way dates are secured during the pandemic, what I would propose to do is set an outside date of March 26 at 10:00 a.m. What we will endeavor to do is put in for a date around March 15, but we will have time excluded, or I propose that time be excluded to March 26 at 10:00 a.m., and that would be an in-person conference. But we will endeavor to have this scheduled for an earlier point in time, perhaps as much as two weeks before, but that will depend on the schedule of the MCC.

Let me inquire of my courtroom deputy.

Flo, would that be a workable solution here?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: I think the best date to do it is

March 24, the 23rd or 24th.

THE COURT: All right. Let's put it on for March 24 at 11, and that's the outside date. We will do it in the courtroom on that day, March 24 at 11. And if we are able to get — that will be in courtroom 11D. If we are able to get a date for a telephonic conference before then, then we'll do that.

Does that work, Flo?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, that works.

THE COURT: OK. So that's what we'll do.

March 24 at 11, recognizing that we may move it up to a telephone conference before that date. Is that acceptable to the government?

MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor. That works for the government.

THE COURT: Is that acceptable, Ms. George, to you and your client?

MS. GEORGE: Yes, your Honor. And thank you.

THE COURT: Same question, Mr. Feitel?

MR. FEITEL: Yes, your Honor. It is acceptable.

THE COURT: Let me hear the government's -- unless there is anything else somebody wants to raise, I'll hear the government's final application.

MR. WIRSHBA: Nothing further from the government, your Honor.

The government would seek to exclude time between now and the date of the next conference in March. I missed the exact date that you settled upon.

THE COURT: March 24 at 11 a.m.

MR. WIRSHBA: March 24, your Honor, until that date to allow the defense to continue to review discovery, to allow for the parties to engage in discussion by a possible pretrial disposition, and in light of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

THE COURT: Ms. George, any objection?

MS. GEORGE: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Feitel, any objection?

MR. FEITEL: No, your Honor. I spoke with my client beforehand, and he agrees to waive speedy trial until the return of court.

THE COURT: All right. I find that the ends of justice will be served by granting a continuance to March 24, and that the need for a continuance outweighs the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The reasons for my finding are that the time is needed to enable defense counsel to review discovery, to make it available to their clients, to discuss the discovery with their clients, and to be in the position to return to court to advise the court whether there are any motions they wish to make in the case, and accordingly, the time between today and March 24, 2021, is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act.

Anything further from the government?

MR. WIRSHBA: Nothing further from the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further from the defendants?

MS. GEORGE: Not on behalf of Mr. Salguero-Portillo.

Thank you, your Honor.

MR. FEITEL: Nor on behalf of Otto Salguero, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you all very much. I appreciate it.

L1KsMORc Please stay well and healthy. Thank you, all. MR. FEITEL: Thank you, your Honor. MS. GEORGE: Thank you. (Adjourned)